



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Synopses of Important Articles.

THE PENTATEUCH AND THE PRIESTLY DUES. By the REV. HENRY HAYMAN, D.D., in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1895. Pages 18-28.

The alleged discrepancies between Deuteronomy and the middle pentateuchal books assume especial importance as regards their representation of the position, functions and provisions for the priest-Levites and the assignment of tithes in particular which they contain. This article is limited to the subject of priestly dues, including tithes, oblations of all kinds and their contingent perquisites.

Deuteronomy does not mention that tithes are such dues. Here they seem to be allotted to the "soilers," to be consumed on festive occasions, to which the Levite was to be a party only (Deut. 12:6 f.; 14:22-29; 26:12 f.). In Numbers (18:20, 21) it is claimed that Jehovah was to be the inheritance of Levi, represented in the tithes, subject, however (vs. 26) to the deduction of one-tenth—the tithe of the tithe—due to the priestly house *par excellence*. On close inspection this seeming conflict vanishes. In Deut. 18:1, 2 the fire-offerings of Jehovah and his inheritance are there made the portion of "the priests, the Levites and the whole tribe of Levi" with special stress on verse 2. Also in Deut. 10:9 we read "Jehovah is his [Levi's] inheritance, as Jehovah Elohim promised." The explanation hinges on this term which is fully explained by turning to Num. 18:20, 21, where Jehovah says to Aaron, "Thou shalt have no inheritance in their land . . . I am thy part and thy inheritance among the children of Israel. And behold I have given the sons of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance." Deuteronomy, then, being more popular in form, does not need to specify each particular. The fire-offerings include all the offerings in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers known as sin, guilt, peace, or simply burnt offerings. The most comprehensive passage in the Pentateuch regarding the priestly dues is that of Num. 18:8 f. Deuteronomy does not need to give any corresponding list to the one last mentioned in Numbers. The one which comes the nearest thereto is Deut. 12:6. That in Numbers above cited is an enumeration of what the priests are to receive; in Deuteronomy it is of what the people are to bring to the sanctuary. Among these the term tithe occurs, meaning, probably, the "second tithe" only. Thus we see how the finer technicalities and requirements of Numbers are sunk in the broadly graded order of Deuteronomy. Again in Deuteronomy, which gives the popular side of the matter, we read in 12:27 after the prohibition of the blood, a distinct permission to the worshiper: "The blood of thy sacrifices shall be poured out upon the altar . . .

and thou shalt eat the flesh." Conversely we find that where the priestly rules leave the question open, Deuteronomy fills the gap in Leviticus and both are in harmony. Without specifying further we find that the whole proves the mutual interdependence of the popular and priestly *corpus juris*, and shows that without reference to Leviticus-Numbers we cannot clearly comprehend Deuteronomy.

Dr. Hayman makes a serious attempt to harmonize passages which are in conflict, as it seems. His theory is plausible, though it will hardly be accepted by those who hold the views which he combats. It is sincerely to be hoped that some specialist in this line will take up the subject with which he grapples and give us a comprehensive statement of the case and the best results of his investigations.

PRICE.

ST. LUKE THE HISTORIAN OF THE CHURCH. By REV. ARTHUR WRIGHT, M.A., Tutor of Queen's College, Cambridge. In the *Thinker* for December, 1894.

Of the three synoptists, the second writes as a catechist, the first as a theologian, the third as an historian. St. Luke's right to be considered an historian is to be seen not merely because of his "editorial notes" added by way of description or interpretation to his sections, but also from his evident attempt to give chronological arrangement and dates. He also is careful to give names of persons and places.

I. His dates. In the time of Christ there was no uniform method of reckoning years. Common reason was therefore bound to adopt the names of local and cosmopolitan magistrates. Luke, therefore, is following the common practice in his use of "in the days of Herod the king of Judea," "when Quirinius was Proprætor of Syria," etc. Compared with the other New Testament writers, who seldom give a date at all, Luke is here the true historian, and renders great aid in enabling us to determine New Testament chronology.

II. The chronological arrangement of his narratives. Here there is need of distinguishing between the accounts given by him from first and those given from second-hand information. In the former case his arrangement is perfect (*e.g.*, the "we-section" in Acts), while in the latter it is by no means so. The Gospel begins and ends, it is true, with the true sequence as far as the events narrated indicate their own order; but in other parts of his Gospel, St. Luke simply follows St. Mark whose order was made for convenience in teaching, and not as the facts occurred. In the unique section Lk., 9:51-18:14, the sections are massed on no discovered principle. In the first half of the Acts there appears also to be some displacement (*e.g.*, the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch must have occurred later than that of Cornelius). This Gospel, notwithstanding his preface, is the least orderly of the three.

III. His proper names. Here we consider, so far as names of persons are

concerned, only those of contemporaries; 50 are introduced into the Gospel, and 95 into the Acts, 18 of the 50 and 63 out of the 95 are not mentioned by other writers. So far as concerns geographical names, Luke's knowledge is considerable. In the Acts he mentions 32 countries, 54 cities, 9 islands. And his knowledge of these places is correct and minute (to be seen by comparing his accounts with those of Smith and Ramsay). In the Gospel the sweep is naturally much more confined. There he mentions 1 lake, 1 river, 8 countries, 19 cities, but few of these are unmentioned by other evangelists.

In St. Luke's use of names we may gain data for explaining the fact that about three-fourths of St. Mark's Gospel is found embodied in his. St. Mark gives 86 proper names of persons and places, but St. Luke reduces this number by 24. This omission would hardly have been possible had he possessed a written copy of St. Mark's Gospel. But the omission of unfamiliar places would have been natural in an oral tradition among gentiles. St. Luke, then, probably used this oral tradition.

These names are, further, of great help in settling the authenticity of the Acts, and to a less degree, that of the Gospel. Had Luke been one of the twelve this would have been very different. We should then have had, probably, clear geographical descriptions of Christ's journeys, the names of those miraculously healed, the local settings of the parables. But while the gain to the student would have been enormous, the faith of the church needs no such collection of vivid details.

The statistical material of this article is valuable; but as a whole, though helpful, it is open to criticism. Especially do we question the author's well-known position upon the synoptic question. We should expect, also, some discussion of the chronological knowledge of the Gospel. It is disappointing, further, that the author has left untouched the vast region of historical allusions—both to social and political institutions. Such passages as Luke 24:13, 20; 12:13; Acts 21:28; 14:6; 5:37, while not easily tabulated, are nevertheless full of suggestion as to Luke's attention to details. An attentive and critical study of his Gospel and the Acts will give an astonishing amount of evidence of Luke's care and accuracy. As a sample of what is possible, it will be interesting to supplement this article with the little pamphlet of Dr. Julius Röttig, *Der Evangelist Lucas als Kenner der Verhältnisse seiner Zeit*. S. M.